

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**WILMORE LEE WASHINGTON, III,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**FARMINGTON ESTATES OWNERS  
ASSOCIATION, an Oregon corporation;  
NORTHWEST COMMUNITY  
MANAGEMENT, LLC, an Oregon  
company; SARA BERG; MICHAEL  
ORRANTIA; KATIE PATTERSON;  
BRIAN HESS; JENNIFER LAYTON;  
THE MANAGEMENT TRUST;  
NATALIE SEIBEL,**

Defendants.

Case No. 3: 21-cv-01032-YY

**ORDER ADOPTING F&R**

Wilmore Lee Washington, III, Beaverton, OR. Pro se.

Christopher M. Parker and Francesco Fischer, Davis Rothwell Earle & Xochihua, PC, 200 SW Market St., Suite 1800, Portland, OR 97201. Attorneys for Defendants Farmington Estates Owners Association, Northwest Community Management, LLC, Sara Berg, Michael Orrantia, Katie Patterson, Brian Hess, and Jennifer Layton.

Marley Masser and Chris M. Morgan, Barran Liebman LLP, 601 SW Second Avenue, Suite 2300, Portland, OR 97204. Attorneys for Defendants The Management Trust and Natalie Seibel.

///

**IMMERGUT, District Judge.**

On May 17, 2024, Magistrate Judge Youlee Yim You issued her Findings and Recommendations (“F&R”), ECF 110, recommending that Natalie Seibel’s Motion to Dismiss, ECF 102, be DENIED as to Plaintiff’s claim against Seibel for disparate treatment under the Fair Housing Act, and be GRANTED as to all other claims against her. No party filed objections. This Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge You’s F&R.

**STANDARDS**

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), as amended, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party objects to a magistrate judge’s F&R, “the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* But the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the F&R that are not objected to. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). Nevertheless, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge, *sua sponte*” whether de novo or under another standard. *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154.

\\

**CONCLUSION**

No party having filed objections, this Court has reviewed the F&R, ECF 110, and accepts Judge You’s conclusions. Judge You’s F&R, ECF 110, is adopted in full. Accordingly, this Court DENIES Defendant Seibel’s Motion to Dismiss, ECF 102, as to Plaintiff’s claim against

Seibel for disparate treatment under the Fair Housing Act, and GRANTS Defendant Seibel's Motion to Dismiss as to all other claims against her.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 7th day of June, 2024.

/s/ Karin J. Immergut  
Karin J. Immergut  
United States District Judge